WO

_

VS.

Global Linguistic Solution, et al.,

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Marlene Ziya, No. CV-10-2021-PHX-DGC

Plaintiff, ORDER

Defendants.

The Court previously entered an order dismissing Plaintiff's complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, but allowing Plaintiff to file an amended complaint by November 5, 2010. Doc. 9. When Plaintiff did not file an amended complaint by that date, the Clerk entered judgment terminating this action. Doc. 10. The Court subsequently reinstated the case and extended the time for Plaintiff to file an amended complaint to January 21, 2011. Docs. 12, 14. On January 25, 2011, Plaintiff filed a motion to reinstate the case and to extend the time to file an amended complaint due to car problems Plaintiff encountered on her way to the courthouse on January 21. Doc. 15. Plaintiff simultaneously filed an amended complaint that purports to assert diversity jurisdiction and claims for breach of contract, fraud, employment discrimination, and various torts. Doc. 16.

Because this case was not terminated when the January 21, 2011 deadline passed, the motion to reinstate the case will be denied as moot. In the interests of justice, the

Court will grant the motion to extend the deadline for filing an amended complaint to January 25, 2011. Plaintiff is advised that she is responsible for serving process on Defendants, that is, serving each of them with a summons and a copy of the complaint, pursuant to Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Plaintiff is reminded (*see* Doc. 9) that she must become familiar with, and follow, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Rules of the United States District Court for the District of Arizona ("Local Rules"). *See King v. Atiyeh*, 814 F.2d 565, 567 (9th Cir. 1986) (pro se litigants "must follow the same rules of procedure that govern other litigants"); *Carter v. Comm'r of Internal Revenue*, 784 F.2d 1006, 1008 (9th Cir. 1986) ("Although pro se, [plaintiff] is expected to abide by the rules of the court in which he litigates."). The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure are available at the following Internet website: http://www.law.cornell.edu/rules/frcp/. A copy of the Court's Local Rules of Civil Procedure may be obtained from the Clerk's Office and are available online at the Court's Internet website: www.azd.uscourts.gov (follow hyperlink titled "Opinions/Orders/Rules").

If Plaintiff fails to prosecute this action, or if she fails to comply with the rules or any Court order, the Court may dismiss the action with prejudice pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure. *See Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260 (9th Cir. 1992); *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 54 (9th Cir. 1995).

IT IS ORDERED:

- 1. Plaintiff's motion to reinstate the case (Doc. 15) is **denied** as moot.
- 2. Plaintiff's motion for an extension of time to file an amended complaint (Doc. 15) is **granted**.

Plaintiff is responsible for serving process on Defendants pursuant to 3. Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Dated this 15th day of March, 2011. Samel G. Campbell David G. Campbell United States District Judge